

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 38

Wednesday, September 23, 1959

Washington, D. C.

News Section

THE VISIT: *Khrushchev meets the press*.....(page 1)

ROCKEFELLER: *The source of his support*.....(page 1)

DEMOCRATS: *Doing the splits*.....(page 2)

JUNKET: *Propaganda for public power*.....(page 3)

MILTON: *Still calling the shots*.....(page 4)

Khrushchev: Working members of the National Press Club had no illusions about Khrushchev after his performance at the luncheon the Club gave him last week. They found him evasive to an extreme, arrogant, insolent and unyielding in his determination to force on the US the kind of "peace" the Kremlin wants. This feeling was heightened after the luncheon when they discovered that Khrushchev's own interpreter had "edited out" and softened some insolent references in the Soviet dictator's remarks. Apart from two shows of temper, Khrushchev probably succeeded in fooling some TV watchers that he was just a "bright, jovial little fellow"; but not the newspapermen in the club.

The applause heard on TV from the Press Club audience came mostly from 50-odd Soviet reporters planted at the luncheon.

Some of the American newsmen, discussing the matter later, thought editors and reporters throughout the country should set up their own "truth squad" operation in their columns. Why, wondered the reporters, did Khrushchev not honestly answer the question, "How about what you did in Hungary?" One reporter remarked: "He brushed off the Hungarian question as a 'dead rat'; why didn't the moderator ask him, 'How about a very live and present issue—Laos?'" And so on.

Indeed, if a mass meeting were held next week, with top liners such as Senators Bridges and Dodd speaking, such a "truth" operation might be carried on to correct Khrushchev's lies and support Ambassador Lodge in his task of doing the same thing.

But Washington's word on Khrushchev's performances both at the Press Club and on Capitol Hill (before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) is that he is a "Fifth Amendment" evader of pointed questions and a long-winded gas bag "filibusterer."

● Although some members of the Washington police force harassed a few people attempting to show their orderly disapproval of the Khrushchev visit by wearing black armbands and waving black pirate flags, one fellow they couldn't stop was a skywriter 10,000 feet over Washington, who carved a mile by mile-and-a-half Christian cross in the sky above the city as Khrushchev motored through the streets.

Credit for the idea belongs to Nicholas T. Nonnenmacher, president of the anti-Communist Christianform and a HUMAN EVENTS editor.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
Riverton, Idaho 83400
● There was no display of Soviet flags on the parade route from the airport to Blair House. The State Department ordered 4,000 small red hammer-and-sickle Soviet flags from American factories. But workers in these factories threatened to go on strike if the order was accepted.

● Knowledgeable observers of the press are keeping an eye peeled for any newsmen who may choose to join the "keep your visa warm" club. It is well known in the fourth estate that reporters, who come out of Russia and tell all or cause the Red censors trouble while they are there, eventually find their visas cancelled.

With the present "exchange" atmosphere a number of eager beavers are intent on not offending Moscow officials who can withhold a visa.

Hence a noticeable tendency of some newsmen to depict Russia as having more "freedom," civil liberties and better living conditions under Khrushchev than Stalin. Little or nothing is said of slave labor camps and various other persecutions.

Rockefeller Potential: Despite Nixon's lead in his race with Rockefeller, none of the Vice President's entourage has any illusions about the great power residing in Rockefeller's wealth and connections. Few, if any of the evidences of this octopus-like power, centering in New York, can be quoted or documented publicly. But, in view of experiences in previous nominating campaigns, the pros advising Nixon remain alert to a growing danger from the Rockefeller potential.

"If you were a delegate to the convention," asked one pro, "and were a lawyer say in Indiana, and got a phone call from a Rockefeller-controlled big law firm in New York, making a pitch in favor of Rocky, what would you do? You had been receiving a lot of business from that law firm and you do not want to lose it. I guess the question answers itself."

This is no new story to professional politicians. The Eisenhower-for-President organization had a certain "Commodore Hotel operation" (very secret) which performed a lot of similar tricks in the nomination race in 1952. HUMAN EVENTS on January 23, 1952, reported that "pressure is now being applied" by Wall Street bankers, with international interests, on Midwest businessmen "who favor Taft but have the misfortune to owe money to these Eastern bankers. We have, on investigation, spotted several cases in which businessmen, leaders in their trans-Appalachian communities, have received communications from their New York creditors, urging them to join Eisenhower committees and to raise or contribute funds thereto. These debtors happen to favor Taft and/or MacArthur and are not happy about the communications. For they want no trouble with the gentlemen who hold the notes."

Today, in one hinterland state, New Hampshire, familiar signs are reappearing. A pro-Rockefeller committee has been formed which many leading citizens have been persuaded to join. From Concord, HUMAN EVENTS learned that telephone calls from New York have proved effective.

One "liberal" columnist, Ralph McGill, has been constrained to recognize the existence and power of the Rockefeller organization—especially its control of huge philanthropic foundations. He remarks that "like the iceberg, most of it is beneath the surface" (Washington Star, September 12).

As a veteran political observer, McGill also has to report a disturbing implication. "It is true that if the American people once sense that such a powerful, anonymous force is behind Governor Rockefeller, they may become suspicious of such bigness and of its power. The fact that it is unseen may make it mysteriously fearful." Like the labor boss octopus (which is less "unseen"), with all its money and pressure techniques, it could encounter a rising of the people such as happened in the last Congress. It would be a tragic mistake, say Capital pros, if the GOP does not recognize this menace within its midst.

YOUR FRATERNITY OR SORORITY should get **HUMAN EVENTS**. Surveys indicate that each issue is read by from 10 to 25 students in each chapter; many lively debates follow. Send \$7 for a college-year (8-month) subscription—for as many chapters as you can afford.

Moon Shot: Sober examination of the discussion about the Soviet shot to the moon has by this time produced some reactions which Washington scientific authorities have exclusively given to HUMAN EVENTS:

(1) The shot has no direct military implications. It showed that the Soviets have developed a more powerful thrust in their rocketry, but we have known that for some time. Also, it has produced nothing to indicate that the Soviet rocketeers have any more accurate directional ability than the US.

(2) However, it confirms frequent warnings in HUMAN EVENTS that Soviet science and technology progress is not to be despised. While the new stunt does not signify that the USSR has a greater scientific and technological potential than the US, it does illustrate that by "crash programs," and concentration of these skills on definite objectives, Soviet Russia poses a great danger to the US.

Scientists here emphasize that the US lag in missile development stems from: (1) The post-war period when a large number of American scientists did not want to work on development of weapons; when Roosevelt at Yalta let the Russians take the German missile base in East Germany and many German scientists; when Truman let the Russians get the jump on us; and finally—when leakage of US secrets became common via the Communist Fifth Column in the Government (which Harry called "a red herring").

(2) The fact that the US has not organized a "crash program," mobilizing our great scientific resources for such a development. As one put it, "Russia does not waste its skills on developing new skin deodorants, nor

color television, nor peaceful atomic reactor work. Hence its propaganda victory last week."

Eisenhower last week backed up Nixon's doubt of Red claims their moon shot hit target, suggesting the projectile "vaporized" before arriving.

Despite our failure to organize efficiently and push forward missile development, we have made good progress. The recent firing of an ICBM prototype 4,400 miles across the Pacific to hit a target is encouraging. The maintenance of our powerful Strategic Air Command and all its planes is at present decisive as a deterrent.

However, scientific and military circles here urge that we "not rest on our oars." Some fear that the Soviets may be concentrating with some progress on weapons which could provide successful interception of our bombers. The US—it is emphasized—should not rest easy until we have a big stockpile of operational ICBMs. For the recent ICBM success was by a prototype; the missile is not yet in quantity production. To accomplish this essential task, it is again being urged that a crash program of similar dimensions and direction as produced the atom bomb in World War II be gotten under way. Such a program would require little if any more in appropriations than are available at present. But it would demand the mobilization of scientific and technological skills and the wise use of priorities which marked the great success of General Groves in 1942-45.

Democratic Splits: The rips, rents and internal rumbles in the Democratic party, piling one upon the other in quick succession, would have rated as the outstanding story of the past fortnight, had not the Khrushchev visit coverage blanketed them. These developments came as the Democratic leadership lamely adjourned Congress with the weakest record of any leadership in many years. Starting on the offensive last January (following the Democratic victory in last fall's elections), the Johnson-Rayburn leadership advocated a wild spending orgy as their program, but ended by bowing to a revived coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats and of course to the President's popular tack towards a new conservative policy. Back of this wave of conservative power on Capitol Hill and in the White House was an aroused electorate which demanded a reduction of spending and a strong labor reform bill. Many Democrats, heeding the constituents, backtracked from the "liberal" position they had held last January.

Hence, Washington shows no surprise (although the press in the country does) at such a phenomenon as the outburst last week of Louis Hollander, head of New York state's COPE (AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education) in caustically criticizing the Johnson-Rayburn leadership in Congress, while praising the record of Republican Governor Nelson Rockefeller and Republican Senators Javits and Keating of that State.

The labor boss suggested that his organization might support Rockefeller, Javits and Keating, provided of course the latter conform to the labor unions' demands. He gave special praise to Governor Rockefeller.

But this civil war was not confined to New York. In Kansas City, Missouri, the Democratic Midwest Con-

Article Section I

The Byrd Machine Will Survive

Exploding a Myth About the Virginia Senator

By JAMES J. KILPATRICK

Editor, *The Richmond News Leader*

ON THE DAY after Virginia's primary election of July 14, Ralph McGill of the *Atlanta Constitution* strode up to Sinai, as is his daily custom; and Thursday morning he cast down the word to his constituents below:

"Virginia's Byrd machine," said the great man, "is broken. The Byrd machine has been knocked out."

In the fashion of professional oracles the world over, to be sure, Mr. McGill hedged his bet. Governor Almond, he allowed, might fashion a new oligarchy in a form somewhat resembling the old, but the Byrd organization as such, he decreed, was done for.

If the sage of Atlanta were the only pundit passing this melancholy judgment, it might be possible, as it so often is possible, to ignore him. But the woods seem to be full of political undertakers; from New York to the West Coast, various morticians have put on their derbies and made ready to lay poor Harry in the grave. It will come as a terrible disappointment to these happy pallbearers to discover, as they will before long, that the rumors of the Organization's death have been greatly exaggerated:

The "Byrd machine" is merely in the shop for repairs. It will be ticking away, a good grandfatherly clock, when Virginia's General Assembly meets next winter.

Those of us who cover Virginia politics for a living have been through this before. Some of my more funereal brethren, abroad in the land, may share the ignorance out of which the Georgia Moses declared that, at last spring's legislative session, the Byrd Organization "suffered its first defeat in history." Mr. Byrd's invisible oligarchy has suffered many defeats in its history. And it has bounced back from them all.

Understanding the "Byrd machine" is a little like understanding metaphysics. Known simply as the Organization, it has no organization. It is identified with Senator Byrd, but Mr. Byrd, *in propria persona*, often is remote from it. Thought to be an aristocracy, the Organization draws its greatest strength from the branch-heads. As a political force, it operates as gently as a zephyr; it cannot be defined, bounded, described in a single crisp sentence any more than a cloud can be trapped in a bottle. The Organization is the political manifestation of the

conservative spirit of Virginia, and those who would exorcise such a persistent ghost have a difficult job on their hands.

BANISHMENT of this lively shade has been tried often enough before. There were many who proclaimed the death of the Byrd Organization back in 1937, when a formidable political foe, James H. Price, won the Virginia governorship. This was undoubtedly a major defeat for the machine: The triumphant invader fired Byrd lieutenants by whole platoons, reorganized the government, and drafted a pastel program of New Deal legislation for the Assembly. But the Organization, politely and agreeably, as all things are done in Virginia, took care of its distinguished casualties, reorganized the reorganization, and scuttled the Governor's legislative ship. An unseemly word was hardly even spoken. And in 1941, a resurrected Organization was back in the Mansion again.

A dozen years later, the Byrd leadership in the Virginia House of Delegates encountered mutiny below. A faction arose, known as the "Young Turks," that seriously challenged some of the administration's economy programs. It is sometimes wondered, even today, whatever became of the Young Turks? The attractive Mr. Quesenberry, a witty fellow, was given a judgeship in Waynesboro; the able John Spiers, God rest him, became a judge in Radford; the suave and brilliant Walter Page was elevated to the bench in Norfolk. One or two others were judiciously defeated in primary elections; two were peacefully permitted to win election to the State Senate, where their bright candles would shed a feeblor light. The rest of the Young Turks were left alone to grow older and wiser; and they have; and they are members of the Organization now. Like the inscrutable Chinese, the Organization does not so much defeat its enemies as embrace them.

Certainly the Organization has survived defeats before. It survived severe defeat in 1956 on a tax rebate plan sponsored by the Senator's son. It hasn't controlled Virginia's Ninth District, in the Southwest tip of the State, for many years. The Sixth and the Tenth Districts are represented by Republicans—friendly, Byrd-like Republicans, it is

true, but no credit to a "machine" as powerful as Mr. Byrd's is supposed to be. The Organization has manifest faults and weaknesses. But dead? The political paths of Virginia are strewn with the broken swords of men who have sought to hack this bodiless beast to death.

Just so, the Byrd Organization will survive the two blows it has suffered this year. In April, a group of Byrd legislators, termed the Massive Resisters, clashed head-on with another group of legislators known as the Perrows (after a State Senator from Lynchburg, Mosby G. Perrow, who headed a commission on school integration problems). On several key votes, the Massive Resisters lost. Then, in July, two of the Massive Resisters were defeated in the primary, and two of the Perrows won reelection over spirited opposition.

BUT WHEN DISTANT "LIBERALS" jubilantly interpret these little contretemps to mean that "the Byrd machine has been knocked out," they are substituting dream for reality. It never was really clear, to be perfectly honest about it, what the April fight was all about. With a handful of exceptions, the Perrows and the Massive Resisters are as one in their resentment of compulsory integration of Virginia's schools. Their dispute began largely as a dispute over strategy in fighting the Supreme Court's school decrees: Was it better, in devising new laws, to bear with the bills they had than fly to others that they knew not of? Before long, unhappily, the dispute fell into an argument over manners — over parliamentary procedure — and some committee chairman cried, in effect, that precedent had been violated and his honor had been impugned. After that there was no adjournment for days. It could not have been otherwise in Virginia. In the end, it was said that most of Governor Almond's plan had been passed, which was true; but it also was said that the Byrd Organization had been fatally divided, which was false.

Beyond question, it may be conceded, a serious split has developed between Governor Almond and the Byrd Organization. Mr. Almond, an able attorney and a former judge, knew from the outset of the school controversy that when legal delays finally ran out, it would prove impossible for Virginia simultaneously to maintain all of its public schools on a completely segregated basis. But in the zeal of a hot campaign in 1957, regrettably, he kept this knowledge to himself. Repeatedly he pledged his determination to resist; the impression he left was that he would "go to jail" or "cut off my right arm" before he would consent to school integration in any degree. They loved him in Southside then; they despise him today. The Governor, it is said, didn't "walk the last mile."

ARTICLE SECTION I

Mr. Almond, if he wanted to, could not possibly recapture any following in these great bastions of the Byrd Organization. It is equally inconceivable that the State's growing army of Negro voters would rally behind him, or that he would seek their support. And there is this, too: In January of 1962, when Mr. Almond completes his term (he cannot succeed himself), he will be nearly 64 years old, and there will be no major political office then up for grabs.

ULTIMATELY, leadership of the Organization will have to be assumed by someone, and doubtless there will be considerable jousting and infighting when that day arrives. But the essential unity of spirit and purpose of Virginia conservatives is not likely to be damaged, nor will their hold on the Legislature be greatly weakened.

Camelot was not without its fraternal quarrels; the mystic knights of Mr. Byrd's round table have their fractious moments also. These lodge brothers have differences not only on questions of school segregation, but also on questions of a sales tax, an increase in the state gasoline tax, and the operation of various public institutions. They are likely to be at each other's throats—in a gentlemanly way—when a reapportionment of legislative seats is proposed in 1962.

By that time the State will have a new Governor. Every prospective candidate who has been mentioned seriously is firmly identified with the Organization Mr. McGill has just laid to rest. And the reader who is minded to risk a little guesswork on a not-too-long shot might keep one name in mind as the next Governor of Virginia, a popular young State Senator from Winchester who surely would have the endorsement of the dead and broken machine. His name is Harry Flood Byrd, Jr.

James J. Kilpatrick has been a frequent contributor to HUMAN EVENTS. His most recent article, "School Integration — Four Years After," appeared May 12, 1958.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. \$11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for \$1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me reprints of "THE BYRD MACHINE WILL SURVIVE" at \$.....

☐ Payment enclosed

☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies \$1; 35 copies \$2; 125 copies \$5; 300 copies \$10; 1,000 copies \$20. In 5,000 lots \$15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add 1/2c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11

Name

Street

City Zone State

SEPTEMBER 23, 1959

Article Section II

Can Union Power be Curbed?

By EDWARD H. CHAMBERLAIN
Professor of Economics, Harvard University

THE BELIEF that nothing can be done about labor unions is held in large part because of their political power. Labor, like business or farmers or other interest groups, must in the political field be a formidable mixture of the good and the bad, and I do not attempt to make an evaluation here.

I raise the question of political power only because of the defeatist argument that nothing can be done to regulate labor unions.

Union leaders have the problem not only of delivering their own vote but of appealing effectively to nonunion labor—still roughly two-thirds of the non-agricultural working force—and to the many diverse and powerful non-labor elements in society.

The belief that nothing can be done about labor union power reduces to the belief that nothing will be done about it. This kind of fatalism is particularly evident with respect to the inflationary problem. Creeping inflation, we are told, is inevitable—all we can do is accept it and learn to live with it.

Inflation is only one aspect of the general problem. The basis of labor union power is similar to that of any monopoly power—control of a market through collective action—but with the superimposition of decisive elements unique to the labor market.

THE MONOPOLY PROBLEM is simply one of maximum gain, both by the suppression of internal competition and by closing the path of entry to all from outside who would by their participation tend to break down the monopoly. This is precisely the method of monopoly in both the industrial and labor areas.

The striking difference between them is that monopoly in industry has been recognized as a matter of public concern for a long time and has been subjected, with at least partial success, to a program of regulation; whereas labor monopoly, hidden by the attractive phrase "collective bargaining," has hardly been recognized, let alone brought under control.

Concentration of economic power in the labor field is paradoxically very great partly because few people are aware of it. It is hidden because the gains, say in terms of wages or so-called fringe bene-

fits, are made, immediately speaking from the employer instead of from the public.

There is a common belief that higher wages come out of profits; and this is often superficially the case as a short-run proposition. Yet such a belief is in direct conflict with a fundamental long-run principle of economics as hoary and as generally respectable as the famous law of supply and demand, namely, the law of cost: that prices tend to conform to cost of production, including a normal allowance for profits.

Through the law of costs, the power of labor to raise money wages, and so indirectly to raise prices, is fundamentally no different from the power of business to raise prices directly.

Monopoly wages, like monopoly prices, are paid in the end by the public; and it is for this reason that there is exactly as much public interest involved in the regulation of monopoly in the labor field as in the field of industry.

Now the problem of industrial monopoly power, even at those times in history when it has been of the greatest public concern, has never been associated with inflation. How is it therefore that such an association is made in the labor field?

There are several reasons for this:

- *The practice of wage settlements over wide areas on a pattern basis, so that one increase means many more.*

- *The institution of the annual wage increase, augmented by the growing practice of embodying it in long-term contracts.*

- *Competition among labor leaders to outdo their rivals—and we must include competition from employers in non-unionized areas to do even better, so as to avoid unionization.*

- *Finally, the fact that wages are more important than profits as an element in prices.*

The role of union power in cost inflation would seem to indicate that the control of this general inflationary force may be achieved only by putting a damper on thousands of individual wage and price increases.

How then to hold them in check?

The decisive elements unique to the labor market which are mainly responsible for the fact that labor has too much power are not a part of collective bargaining *per se*.

They are accretions of power which have developed partly

This article appeared in the June edition of *The Atlantic Monthly* and is reprinted here, in part, with permission of the publishers of that magazine.

through specific exemptions by Congress and through court interpretations, partly through a failure to understand the problem, but mostly through an uncritical public indulgence which can only be explained by a confused belief that since the labor cause is good, the more power in the hands of labor the better.

As a practical matter, it seems to me that progress could be made in reducing union power by attacking directly those accretions which clearly rest upon privileges and immunities of laborers as compared with other citizens, and which it is therefore reasonable and fair to correct on the simple ground of equal treatment for all.

On the purely economic front, the power accretions are startling. The practice of making a deal with the Teamsters to "honor" a picket line has nothing to do with free speech, as the Supreme Court seems to think it has because it involves picketing, and it has nothing to do with collective bargaining.

It is simply a power gadget to deprive an employer not only of the services of his own workers who are on strike but of all other goods and services as well.

The threat of potential violence and intimidation through the device of the picket line are powerful factors—so powerful, in fact, that nowadays a firm rarely attempts any operations at all if a strike has been called, although it would be within its legal rights to do so.

FOR ALL PRACTICAL PURPOSES the alternative of making a bargain with anyone other than the union has been removed. Even the attempts a few months ago in the bus strike in Massachusetts to run a few buses operated by supervisors for school children were successfully blocked by masses of pickets surrounding the buses. Boycotts, hot cargo rules, refusals to work with nonunion labor or on materials produced by nonunion labor or by the wrong union are used with impunity to close the channels of trade and commerce. These and other privileges and immunities which tremendously augment union monopoly power are unique to the labor market.

Many of these developments are a logical conclusion of what seems to be the overriding principle that a union's economic power must not be compromised. In the further matter of agreements and alliances, for instance, anything is legal so long as only labor groups are involved. No—there is one qualification of mock seriousness:

A union may restrain trade as much as it pleases and combine with others against other unions, against nonunion laborers, against some particular employer, or against the general public, provided only—in the quaint language of the Huthcheson decision—it is acting in its own self-interest!

I have seen a statement by an important labor leader before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress to the effect that even to raise the question of whether unions have too much power is to question their very right to exist.

This is the union point of view, and it seems to be wide-spread. Yet what could be more absurd? Has anyone ever held that to reduce and regulate

monopoly power in the business area was to question the right of business to exist?

Should a union be allowed to strangle a business economically by arranging with the Teamsters to cut off its transportation? It seems to me we might as well ask if a physically strong customer in a retail shop should be allowed to twist the arm of the shopkeeper in order to drive a better bargain with him.

I suggest as a good general rule that no employer should have brought against him pressures exerted by anyone other than his own employees.

A national policy of encouraging collective bargaining, adopted in the middle Thirties in the belief that labor's bargaining power was weak and needed to be strengthened, has encouraged not merely collective bargaining but the development of a wide power complex. The careless view that labor must have enough power to win may have been understandable when labor was the underdog.

● But pilots who can close down airlines in negotiating for top salaries of well over \$20,000 a year are not underdogs.

● When a few hundred workers in New York who merely deliver newspapers after they have been produced can deprive ten million readers of printed news and inflict losses, not only on their employers but on a whole community, estimated at \$50 million, it seems clear that the time has come for a re-evaluation of where the power now lies.

UNIONS HAVE ACHIEVED their present position largely through public indulgence, and if the public becomes less indulgent, union power can be curbed. What is needed is a general awakening to the real nature of the problem. In its fundamentals monopoly power is the same whether used by laborers or by businessmen, and it has the same adverse effect on the rest of society, with an inflationary influence to be added in the case of labor.

It has been subjected to regulation in business; how much longer will it go unregulated in the labor area? Will the rest of society continue to accept the principle that a labor union's freedom in the pursuit of its own self-interest shall be unrestrained?

ORDER BLANK	
HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.	
Send me reprints of "CAN UNION POWER BE CURBED?" at \$.....	
☐ Payment enclosed	☐ Bill me
Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies \$1; 35 copies \$2; 125 copies \$5; 300 copies \$10; 1,000 copies \$20. In 5,000 lots \$15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add 1/2c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.	
Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$11	
Name	
Street	
City Zone State	

ference (comprising representatives from 14 states) split wide open as delegates from eleven of these states walked out of the final session last week. The Old Guard has tried to ignore the rebellion; the insurrectionists—obviously of the Left Wing—were said to have been encouraged by Paul Butler, Democratic National Chairman, who has been aligned with the more “liberal” elements and who has provided the yeast of many ferments within the party in recent years. Among the leaders of the revolt are supporters of Governor “Soapy” Williams of Michigan (Reuther’s boy), Senator John F. Kennedy and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. The Old Guard leaders favor Senator Symington for party nominee in 1960. In Washington, it was the opinion of many observers that behind the rebellion is the hand of Reuther and that his candidate will be Senator Humphrey.

A by-product of this Midwest split would be enhanced chances for re-election next year for five incumbent GOP Senators from that region—Allott (Colo.), Schoepel (Kans.), Curtis (Neb.), Mundt (S.D.) and Martin (Iowa)—most of whom have already been marked for slaughter by the big money-bags of COPE.

One straw in the wind—a poll just taken in South Dakota shows Mundt’s stock rising.

If Humphrey—as now seems likely—looms large as the strong Midwest candidate (with substantial support in California), then the biggest split of all—another revolt of the Southern Democrats—seems more probable than ever. Already five Southern states have set up machinery for independent slates of Presidential electors as a prelude to running their own regional candidate in November, 1960. In 1948, the States Rights candidate, Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, carried four states. Humphrey, with the strongest possible record for enforced “civil rights,” could well touch off a Southern bolt, making the 1948 walkout seem a show of unity by comparison. The civil rights issue provides the tinder for such a bonfire. It was significant that the Senate, as it adjourned last week, witnessed angry protests against even the innocuous “civil rights commission” by the Southern bloc.

DeSapio: On the heels of the Midwestern split in the Democratic Party, a primary election in New York foreshadows an important division of the state’s huge delegation to the 1960 convention.

After draining their big campaign chest and carping away for weeks in their house organ, The New York Post, the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) wing of the party in the September 15 primary again failed to unseat Tammany boss Carmine DeSapio as Greenwich Village district leader.

However, DeSapio’s victory margin of only 586 votes out of 9,000 (he beat his “liberal” opponent by 3-2 two years ago) and the election of anti-DeSapio candidates in other Manhattan districts makes the Democratic picture in the state appear more of a Mexican standoff than ever.

DeSapio still heads the more conservative Jim Farley-type Dems and observers maintain they will undoubtedly lock horns with the ADA-Dave Dubinsky-Eleanor Roosevelt leftist bunch at next summer’s convention.

Steel Strike: There is growing dissatisfaction in and out of the labor movement with David McDonald’s continuing strike against the Nation’s major steel companies.

In a public opinion survey conducted by the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the majority of the responses supported these contentions: (1) the steelworkers union was more at fault than the steel companies in the fact that agreement of the dispute was not reached before the outbreak of the strike, (2) wages of the steelworkers should not be raised, (3) a wage increase would seriously aggravate inflation, make steel price hikes inevitable, (4) steel wages have gone up faster than the workers’ efficiency, (5) record steel profits are not a basis for wage increase demands and are not relevant to the wage question and (6) the Government should not intercede to settle the strike by use of the Taft-Hartley law.

The *Wall Street Journal* recently concluded an extensive survey among union members in 13 major cities and reports these comments by non-steelworkers about McDonald’s strike:

“They’re damn fools for striking. The steelworkers want part of the profits, which are none of their business.” “It’s a foolish strike. . . . There’s got to be a stopping point somewhere in this inflation.” “Those guys (steelworkers) make more in a day than we do in a week and all the strike is going to do is make it harder for a man to live.”

Wasteful Junket: At a time when congressional feeling runs high against costly trips by legislative teams to all parts of the world for every conceivable purpose, a current scandalous, tax-wasting senatorial junket to the Soviet Union clearly illustrates why. Inspired by Senator James Murray (D-Mont.), chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, the group is headed by Democratic Senators Frank Moss (Utah) and Ernest Gruening (Alaska). They are studying Russian production of electricity from hydroelectric plants. These three Senators are strong advocates of complete Federal control and operation of American’s power industry, as is Clyde Ellis—powerful Washington representative of the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association—who joined the inspection team at his own expense. They can be expected to support their own contentions with glowing reports of Soviet accomplishments.

Many Senators disapprove of this junket as being wasteful for these reasons: (1) They would object to any further Government inroads in the power industry; (2) a team of private utility experts returned from Russia with an adverse report on that nation’s ability to out-produce the US in the electrical field; and (3) Interior Secretary Fred Seaton has testified that, unlike the USSR, America is not forced to depend upon hydroelectric facilities to generate electricity.

He says that in addition to the eventual use of atomic power for this purpose, the US has sufficient (almost inexhaustible) reserves of coal, oil, natural gas and shale to feed our power plants for the next 2,000 years.

Milton’s Paradise: General A. C. Wedemeyer (author of the best seller *Wedemeyer Reports!* Holt, \$6), alluded recently to reports that it was Milton Eisenhower’s idea to bring Khrushchev to America (radio broadcast, WFBR,

Baltimore, August 23). But it has remained for Constantine Brown, nationally syndicated columnist, to present the best inside picture of what led to the visit.

According to Brown, the President's brother—when he was on the August trip to Moscow—suggested to Khrushchev a plan for solution of the Berlin crisis. This was that Soviet Russia guarantee the status quo in Berlin and free access to the city from West Germany in exchange for withdrawal of allied forces from the Western sector of Berlin. Milton suggested that acceptance by Russia of such a proposal might lead to a summit conference in the US. Khrushchev bluntly rejected such a "deal."

Constantine Brown says: "He (Khrushchev) replied that there can be no connection between Russia's position in regard to Berlin and his invitation to America. He added that unless relations between the two great powers were improved by an exchange of visits between him and President Eisenhower this year, he would not be responsible for what might happen in Berlin or in other portions of Europe and the Middle East."

What did Milton Eisenhower do? According to this columnist, he got in touch (presumably by coded radiogram) with the President and "impressed on his brother the urgent need to attempt a solution of the growing crisis by an exchange of visits."

The Brown story, appearing in the *Washington Star*, has inspired much comment—among which two points are made: (1) Milton Eisenhower must have had a secret and private interview with the Russian boss, attended only by interpreters. Several weeks ago reports of such an interview met with somewhat belated official denials. Rumors from State Department circles in the past few days reinforce the belief that this parley took place.

(2) Congress and the country face a situation unprecedented in the history of our constitutional Government. A brother of the President (who has publicly expressed his great admiration for that brother's knowledge and judgment on public affairs) acts as a decisive go between. Milton Eisenhower holds no office, appointive or elective, and is not subject to congressional questioning or control. No one in the Capital doubts the preponderant influence of Milton on the President. Yet his report and recommendations to the President—as related in the Brown story—obviously led the President to reverse the Dulles policy and to launch this experiment in personal diplomacy.

Milton Eisenhower has made few public statements in recent years on any controversial policy. However, an insight into his international attitude was reported by HUMAN EVENTS on April 23, 1955, which noted his preface and endorsement of a pamphlet on UNESCO. The pamphlet says that educators "have a great role to play in helping to build up the outlooks and attitudes which would favor the establishment of World Government." Milton Eisenhower says in his foreword that the author of the pamphlet "paints in swift, colorful strokes an international effort with which I've been *intimately involved and to which I am profoundly committed*." (Italics ours)

Aid To Reds: The Senate adjourned in a rush at dawn September 15 to avoid meeting Khrushchev—but it left

behind a token of its esteem for the Red boss in the form of a bill permitting economic aid to the East European satellites.

Senators John F. Kennedy (D.-Mass.) and George Aiken (R.-Vt.) sponsored the plan, which would allow the US to give money to the Kadar puppet regime which crushed the 1956 Hungarian revolution, and to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Rumania, at the President's discretion. The bill technically is an amendment to the Battle Act, which prohibits aid to Red nations. Since previous amendments have exempted Yugoslavia and Poland, enactment of Kennedy's measure would exempt all East European nations except Albania and East Germany—and those two are subject to the act only because the US does not have diplomatic relations with them.

Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.) led the fight against the Kennedy-Aiken plan, ripping the supposed need for "flexibility" in US policy and pointing out: "This is an old game that is being played. I stood on the floor of the US Senate back in 1940 and 1941 and proposed and supported a resolution which would have prohibited the shipment of scrap iron and steel to Japan. It was beaten on this floor."

Significantly, passage of the bill got scant coverage in much of the Nation's press, including the Washington papers. The public can still be alerted to make an effective protest, however, since the House must act on the bill in the next session.

Education: Business and industry are playing a role of ever-growing importance in providing financial aid to educational institutions in this country. The Council for Financial Aid to Education reports that even in the recession year of 1958, these sources contributed a record \$136 million to facilities of higher learning.

The Council also reports that total corporation contributions for all philanthropic purposes skyrocketed from \$418 million in 1956 to \$550 million last year.

The *NAM News*, published by the National Association of Manufacturers, comments that corporate giving was spark-plugged some ten years ago "on the theory that if business didn't come to the rescue [of private institutions in serious financial straits] Government would, and that the preservation of private institutions . . . was essential to the future of the free enterprise system."

ANTONI E. GOLLAN, student, Antioch College: "I have found that no publication comes close to HUMAN EVENTS in presenting the facts that all Americans should be aware of."

LEROY BLOMMAERT, student, Loyola University (Chicago): "Every week after reading HUMAN EVENTS, I look forward to the next issue, knowing that it will provide a penetrating analysis not found elsewhere."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS TO HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks \$1.
Yearly rate, \$11; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3.

By first class mail, \$13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$15 a year.
FOREIGN: \$14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, \$21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, \$36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, \$15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHIER, GEORGE O. FOWLER